



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*The Political Future of India.* By LAJPAT RAI. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1919. 237 pp.

The people of India, as well as liberals the world over, owe a debt of gratitude to Lajpat Rai for his sane, unbiased account of the present social, political and economic conditions in his native land as set forth in *The Political Future of India*. Equally grateful should they be for the judicious expression of the ideals to which he would have a politically autonomous India aspire. Not as a heated partisan or a rabid nationalist who would sever all connection with the British Empire does he plead the cause of India and her people; rather in a dispassionate manner he pleads for the establishment of a genuine feeling of affection and a community of interest between Great Britain and India to be brought about by allowing the Indians opportunity and freedom to manage their own affairs, to work out their economic salvation and to develop their own culture subject to the advice and guidance of democratic Britain. And this he states is the wish of the vast majority of the people of India. They are content to remain an integral part of the British Commonwealth if only they are granted the same status of autonomy now enjoyed by the self-governing dominions of the Empire.

If in recent years the people of India have been sullen and unrestful, if the spirit of revolution has rankled in their souls, it is because India has been exploited by powerful vested interests which have operated under a system of absolute rule. In a remarkably lucid manner, Lajpat Rai shows how the people of India under foreign domination have been reduced to a state of almost utter helplessness. Not allowed to develop their own industries, burdened by taxes for the support and maintenance of British army and British office-holders in India, reduced to poverty with all its accompanying misery and degradation, checkmated in their efforts to increase expenditures for education, coerced and repressed by a bureaucratic government, the people of India not unnaturally became restless and revolutionary. They sought liberty of opportunity; they still seek it, and Lajpat Rai would have Britain grant this liberty by allowing India self-government. In the main, he accepts the Montague-Chelmsford proposals, yet in certain instances he would amend or supplement them. The Civil Service he would man with Indians in so far as practicable, he would economize by substantially reducing the unnecessary number of posts now filled by high-salaried Europeans, he would cut the salaries of the lavishly

over-paid officials to the benefit of frightfully under-paid lesser officials. In both the provincial assemblies and in the central legislature he would give the Indians increased power. He would minimize British control over Indian national defense, and, most important of all, he would grant to India "complete fiscal freedom to manage her own affairs, develop her own industries, and do her own trading" (p. 145).

To those who claim that the people of India have no political capacity for self-government, Lajpat Rai strikingly points out that prior to the sixteenth century Asia was as democratic or undemocratic as Europe. He presents historical evidence to prove that during ancient and mediaeval times parts of India were more democratic and enjoyed a greater degree of representative government than did Europe. Even today, the people of India are not less intelligent nor more poor and ignorant than were the people of Great Britain, France and Germany before the advent of the Industrial Revolution. At present they are as capable of self-government as the peoples of the Balkan States, Russia, and Southern Italy who enjoy autonomous government and even absolute independence. To those who see in Indian illiteracy a bar to self-government, he admits the fact of the illiteracy but maintains that the political status of the country is determined more by intelligence and character, and that literacy is by no means a sure index of either. Lastly, to those who see in the religious, racial and caste cleavages obstacles to a unified self-governing India, he points out that the differences are not greater than those which exist between Jew and Gentile or between laborers and capitalists in European countries or between Japanese and Englishmen institutionally.

For Lajpat Rai autonomous India will not be a capitalistic, imperialistic India. It will not copy the civilization of Europe, for that civilization based upon unlimited and uncontrolled private enterprise is, in his opinion, in the process of extinction. "The war has prepared a death-bed for it from which it will never rise." Rather than have India bury itself in the débris of this expiring civilization, which he characterizes as vicious and immoral, he would have her lay the foundation of a civilization "which will reproduce much of what was valuable and precious in our own with much of what we never had" (p. 201).

Real liberty, equality, and opportunity for all is the basis of the demand for Indian home rule. Lajpat Rai has splendidly emphasized the candid statement of Mr. Austin Chamberlain

that "India will not remain, and ought not to remain content to be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for the rest of the Empire."

In conclusion note should be made of the apparent typographical error in quoting "Professor MacDonald" for Professor MacDonnell (p. 21). A synopsis of the Indian Industrial Commissions Report, A Brief Comparative Statement of the Present Indian Constitution, the Montague-Chelmsford scheme of reforms, the Congress-League reform proposals, and Reports of the Committees on Franchises and Division of Functions, are included as appendices.

HARRY J. CARMAN,  
*Columbia University.*

*National Governments and the World War.* By FREDERIC A. OGG AND CHARLES A. BEARD. New York: Macmillan. 603 pp.

The general reader, as well as the student of comparative government, should welcome the appearance of this readable and informing volume, although most of its subject-matter is already available in Professor Beard's *American Government and Politics* (Macmillan, 1910, revised edition, 1913) and Professor Ogg's *Governments of Europe* (Macmillan, 1913). The joint authors have not merely condensed and combined these two works into a volume smaller than either; they have added several entirely new chapters and have included the latest information, up to 1918, regarding changes which have occurred in the last few years. More than that, they have given to the new work a thesis, an interpretation, which was lacking in the original treatises.

The idea which serves as a unifying theme for the entire book is that the World War "was, at bottom, a struggle between two great schemes of human government—autocracy and democracy" (p. v). A new introductory chapter presents, in a few vigorously written paragraphs, the striking contrast between the development of "The Democratic Idea" in England, France, and America, on the one hand, and, on the other, "The Autocratic Ideal of Government" as exemplified in Germany. The picture is drawn in black and white, without half-tones. Perhaps a meticulous critic might object to such unqualified generalizations as that the Hohenzollerns treated their people "as mere taxpayers and 'food for cannon'" (p. 13), or that "the Bill of Rights enacted by the English Parliament in 1689 laid the democratic basis of